
True Pan-Americanism: A Policy of Coöperation with the Other American Republics

Author(s): George H. Blakeslee

Source: *The Journal of Race Development*, Vol. 7, No. 3 (Jan., 1917), pp. 342-360

Published by:

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29738206>

Accessed: 01-08-2014 01:25 UTC

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at

<http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



<http://www.jstor.org>

TRUE PAN-AMERICANISM: A POLICY OF COÖPERATION WITH THE OTHER AMERICAN REPUBLICS

*By George H. Blakeslee, Ph.D., Professor of History and
International Relations, Clark University*

One of the striking facts in connection with our foreign relations is the recent increase of interest throughout the United States in Latin America. This change is shown in many ways, and may be measured in part by definite figures. The leading newspapers in the United States, for example, according to the reports of the statisticians in the Pan American Union, gave more news space to Latin America in a single month of the past year than the same papers gave in the thirty-six months of 1907, 1908 and 1909; our magazines had more articles on Latin America in the first three months of 1916 than in the five years from 1907 to 1912; while more books dealing with Latin America were published in this country in 1914 than in the entire period from 1906 to 1910. A recent bibliography of the two hundred best volumes on South America shows that seven-eighths of them appeared within the past five years.

This increased interest appears in other ways, such as in the teaching of Spanish; at the present time some two thousand educational institutions in this country are giving instruction in Spanish, while ten years ago there were hardly more than fifty. Over 1700 clubs in the United States are making a study of Latin America and Pan American relations; while our leading colleges and universities are now introducing courses on the history, commerce and culture of the states to the south of us. Then there is the people's university, the moving picture show; it is estimated that three thousand moving picture theatres are every week showing to American audiences the people, the scenery, and the life of the republics of South America. Only a few

months ago Director General John Barrett stated that the Pan American Union was then receiving on an average between 200 and 300 letters a day asking for information on Latin American affairs, and added that it was not unusual to have as many as 25 cablegrams a day from Latin America, making various inquiries concerning the United States. About the same time the United States Bureau of Commerce, according to statements in the press, was receiving a daily average of 800 letters from all parts of the country regarding trade openings and economic conditions throughout the Latin American world.

There is no question as to our awakened interest in Latin America, but one naturally queries what has caused it. Probably it is due primarily to recent changes in political and economic conditions: the striking development of such South American countries as Argentina, Brazil and Chile; our anxiety to secure their markets as a field for our surplus manufactured goods, which we have now come to export in large quantities; and our recently felt need of more of the South American products, not only those from the tropics, such as coffee and rubber from Brazil, and cocoa from Ecuador and Venezuela, but beef and mutton from Argentina and Uruguay, and nitrates, iron ore and copper from Chile and Peru. Since the world war began, too, Latin America has been turning eagerly to the United States to secure the money necessary to carry on its great enterprises and even to tide over its strong governments while the money markets of Europe are closed. These recent changes in fundamental conditions, together with the desire to know more of the republics brought nearer to us by our new Panama Canal, the popular descriptions of the beauty and wealth of their leading cities, especially Buenos Aires and Rio de Janeiro, the renewed discussion in this country over the Monroe Doctrine, the propagandist work of the Pan American Union, have all contributed to stimulate a new interest among us in Latin America, and to awaken us to the consciousness that there exist south of us some strong states with stable governments and cultured peoples.

One of the greatest problems before the United States, in its foreign relations, is to determine its proper policy towards this rapidly developing Latin America. It is hardly necessary to point out that the question of our relations to Mexico was the most vital single issue in the recent presidential campaign; but this is only one aspect of the broader Pan American question. In the future too our relations to Latin America will be even more important than at present, for the republics to the south will be continually growing in strength and population, and Europe will be making earnest efforts, as soon as this war is over, to regain and even increase its trade, commerce and economic influence throughout the Latin American world.

It should also be remembered that in the future more than at present, foreign policies will be settled democratically, by the mass of our people, rather than by cabinets or committees of Congress. It is one of the obligations of American citizenship therefore to study the facts regarding our foreign affairs, particularly those relating to our Latin American neighbors, and to help determine the policies which will be best both for our own country and for the rest of the world.

Pan Americanism, the policy of close coöperation among the republics of this hemisphere, is generally advocated from a business viewpoint. Whenever one listens to an address on the subject before a chamber of commerce, one realizes that the dominant thought among our manufacturers is simply how they may sell a greater quantity of goods to Latin America. Commercial relations, to be sure, are important; but it should be pointed out with the greatest emphasis that a genuine, successful Pan Americanism can not be based solely or even primarily upon trade and commerce. Practically every intelligent Latin American will endorse this statement. Pan Americanism, to be successful and lasting, must be based upon common purposes, common ideals, and a friendly coöperation among the various republics in achieving and realizing them.

The possibilities which may result from a genuine Pan Americanism, seem often to be as fully and clearly realized

in Europe as in our own country. A prominent member of the British Cabinet has stated that if a European international council, similar to the Pan American Union at Washington, had been in existence two years ago in any of the great capitals of Europe, there would have been no world war. This British cabinet minister is not the only European to realize these possibilities. They have probably never been more clearly seen than by an Austrian author, Dr. Alfred H. Fried, the winner of the Nobel Peace Prize in 1911. Four years before the war he wrote a book entitled *Pan Amerika*, in order to point out to Europe the frightful abyss towards which its policy of international anarchy was then rapidly pushing it, and to beg the leaders of Europe to create some international organization comparable to the Pan American Union. "Across the Atlantic," he said, "an America exists, but a Europe does not yet exist. European statesmen do not think in terms of Europe as a whole, in the way in which many American statesmen have come to think in terms of America as a whole. When Europe," he continued, "shall have created an international organization which shall serve for the Old World the purpose which the system of Pan American coöperation is coming to serve for the Western World, then there will be some foundation for a possible world peace."

Dr. Fried's prophesy and plea were made before the present war began; the war itself has deepened and intensified the conviction that only by the creation of some kind of international organization may recurring armed conflicts be avoided. The thirty most prominent peace programs of Europe and America practically agree that Hague conferences and international courts are not sufficient to check war, but that the world must have some international council or league or union. They practically ask that the world as a whole shall develop an international organization which shall be for all nations what the system of Pan American coöperation is coming to be for those of the Western Hemisphere.

The realization of this need is also seen in the widespread support given in this country to the recently formed

League to Enforce Peace. But such a league of all the great nations of the world would be far more difficult to create than one limited to the twenty-one American republics. In fact, Pan Americanism should be, in one of its aspects, a league to enforce peace for this hemisphere; and one of its probable results would be to save the New World for all time from such a world crime as is now being committed in Europe.

The possibilities of a genuine Pan American policy are undoubtedly most attractive; but we should consider carefully the obstacles which, it is sometimes claimed, lie in the way of the realization of such a policy, and then examine the bases, if any, on which this policy may rest.

In the first place, is there a Latin America? We speak as if there were two parties to the proposed policy of co-operation, the United States on the one hand and Latin America on the other. But is Latin America a unity? To be sure, the twenty Latin American republics speak substantially the same language,—the Portuguese of Brazil is closely related to the more generally spoken Spanish, while Haiti, where French is dominant, may be disregarded; their educational systems are similar; their religious life is substantially the same; the forms and even the practices of their governments seem to us much alike; while there is a striking similarity in the general culture of the educated classes in every one of the republics. We seem to find, too, some solidarity in feeling and sentiment.

A closer examination, however, of the twenty Latin American republics shows striking differences between them. In fact, Dr. Ernesto Nelson, Commissioner of Education in Argentina, recently said: "the terms Latin America and Latin Americans have no reality back of them, save to the extent of giving a name to a geographical accident." In racial stock they are not at all uniform. Argentina is almost purely European—in fact, the Argentine population is probably more purely European than is the population of the United States, while Bolivia, Peru, Ecuador and Paraguay are more than three-fourths Indian or part-Indian. In geographical situation the southern coun-

tries of South America, Argentina, Chile, Uruguay and Southern Brazil, are in the temperate zone, with all which that means in so many ways, while the rest of Latin America is in the tropics. The various republics also are to a considerable extent isolated from each other. In Buenos Aires for example there are today probably fewer Latin Americans from the entire republic of Colombia than Russians from nearly every province of the Russian Empire. Argentina has a smaller trade with the whole of Spanish America than with the single little Kingdom of Holland; while its commerce with its neighbor, Peru, is only one-fiftieth of that with far-away China. In their schools and universities the Latin Americans lay less stress upon the geography of the Latin American world than upon that of Asia; a student in Venezuela will know less about the states of Chile than about the cantons of Switzerland.

Divisions and jealousies also exist among them. Let anyone try the experiment of calling an educated Argentine a "South American," and see what reaction it brings. The Argentine will undoubtedly reply with mingled irritation and courtesy that he is no "South American" but an "Argentine," and will make it clear that his country has more in common with most of the states in Europe than with such relatively weak Latin American republics as Paraguay and Ecuador. There has even developed recently a feeling among the leading Argentines that it comports better with their dignity and standing to align themselves in international affairs with the United States rather than with their Latin American neighbors.

A further difficulty in the way of a genuine Pan Americanism is thought to lie in the attitude of Latin America, as a whole, towards the United States. While the different republics vary considerably in their feeling towards our country, and while the same republic often alters its sentiment from time to time, yet in all of them there is some latent suspicion and fear of the United States. This fact is due in part to our own history. Latin Americans remember well the account of our conquest of Mexican territory; and they realize keenly and more clearly than do we

the seemingly irresistible extension of the sovereignty, power and political influence of the United States southward into the Latin American world. Such incidents as our occupation of Panama have left an especially unfortunate impression; however earnestly we may defend the action of our government in this matter, we may be well assured that the great majority of thoughtful Latin Americans look upon "the Panama seizure" as a dangerous example of unjustified conquest. This latent suspicion and fear are in part, however, due to a more general cause, the great power of the United States and the relative weakness of even the most advanced of the South American states. As an intelligent South American, in conversation with the writer, expressed it, "the big fishes eat the little fishes;" the Latin American republics realize that they are the little fishes and are naturally somewhat afraid of the big fish of the North.

A still further fact, presented as an obstacle to Pan Americanism, is that Latin America is closer to Europe in some respects than it is to the United States. Steamship communication is certainly quicker and more frequent. When the writer was in Buenos Aires some three years ago one of the Argentines told of his experience in attempting to secure steamship accommodations for Europe; after going the rounds of all of the steamship agencies in the city he found that the staterooms on all of the steamers were engaged so far in advance that he could not secure passage to Europe for six months. One may be very sure, however, that there never would be any difficulty in obtaining accommodations on any steamer leaving Buenos Aires at any time for New York. A similar situation exists in regard to cable news. South America has relatively little information of any kind in its papers regarding the United States, and the few items which do appear are not satisfactory; on the other hand, their leading journals receive every day from Europe between 4,000 and 5,000 cable words summarizing everything of vital interest in the various countries of the Old World. In other respects, too, in their education, literature, religious life, social customs, and styles, they are more closely bound to Europe than they are to us.

These difficulties in the way of a Pan American policy, which are pointed out in order to present the subject with perfect candor, are more apparent than real. Although the various states of Latin America do not form one perfectly homogeneous whole, this fact is not at all important, provided they are sufficiently similar, and have interests in common strong enough, to induce them to act in cordial coöperation. Whatever differences and suspicions may exist between them, and also between them and our own country, these are certainly insignificant compared with the jealousies and enmities which for decades separated the various nations which are now so closely united in the European Entente. If Latin America is bound to Europe in some respects rather than to us, there are other respects in which we have common interests. There are broad and strong bases upon which the superstructure of Pan Americanism may be built.

In the first place there is the common democracy of the governments of North and South America. All of the republics to the South of us have written constitutions which are more or less closely copied from our own. Although their democracy—however poorly we may think of our own—is in actual practice not as successful as that in the United States, nevertheless it is a fact of importance that in form and in ideals the governments of all of the twenty-one American republics rest upon a similar democratic basis.

Still more significant, the United States and Latin America are both organized primarily on the basis of peace; while Europe, in contrast, has long been organized primarily on the basis of aggressive war. The states of North and South America sincerely and strongly believe, as a matter of principle, in settling international differences not by Europe's present method, but by the application of law in international courts and by arbitrations; and in solving problems of common international interest by general international coöperation.

The leadership taken by our own country in the attempt to substitute law and arbitration in place of war, is well

known, but the attitude of Latin America is not so generally understood. The first Pan American Congress, however, at Panama in 1825, was called by Bolivar in part for the purpose of adopting arbitration as a principle of Pan American policy. At the first of the more recent Pan American congresses, at Washington in 1889-90, the delegates of every American republic but one voted for the declaration, "the principle of conquest is eliminated from American Public Law." Only the other day the brilliant Ambassador from Argentina publicly said, the motto "'victory gives no rights,' is the highest expression of our Argentine aspirations." The statesmen of Argentina claim with pride that their Republic is not imperialistic, and point out that they seized no land from Paraguay after that country's complete overthrow in 1870 by the combined armies of Argentina and Brazil. Instead of conquest, Argentina submitted a boundary dispute with Paraguay to the arbitration of President Grover Cleveland, and lost; completely victorious in the war and perfectly able, together with Brazil, to partition Paraguay, it yet loyally accepted this adverse decision. A similar ideal is constantly presented by the statesmen of Brazil. In their present national constitution, adopted in 1891 and closely copied from that of the United States, there is the following clause, "The United States of Brazil shall in no case engage in a war of conquest, directly or indirectly, by itself or in alliance with another nation." A prominent Venezuelan in writing of the devotion of the Latin American states to the principle of peaceful international settlement, says,

In recent years we have had recourse to arbitration, and direct negotiations partaking often of the nature of arbitration, more frequently than in all the rest of the world. . . . In our international difficulties arbitration has always been the keynote of our negotiations. . . . All our boundary disputes—and they have been many—have been or are being settled by arbitration.

As further evidence of the attitude of Latin America, it may be added that the A. B. C. countries (Argentina, Bra-

zil and Chile) a few months ago signed a joint treaty, by which they have bound themselves, before resorting to war, to refer every possible difference which may arise between any of them, which they are unable to settle by direct negotiation, to an international court, or to a board of conciliation for examination and recommendation.

Throughout Latin America then in spite of the revolutionary outbreaks in its less advanced lands, and notwithstanding a certain amount of latent imperialism in one or two countries, there is a general agreement in the principle that international wars on this hemisphere should end, that existing boundaries should be respected, and that international differences should be settled by some form of arbitration or mediation.

A still further basis for American solidarity is found in the common interests of Latin America and the United States. Anyone doubtful of the reality of these interests should read the report of the recent Pan American Financial Congress, held in May, 1915, and note the earnestness with which the delegates of the strongest South American republics asked the United States to unite with them in carrying out enterprises which no one of their states was strong enough to accomplish by itself. They were particularly anxious that this country should coöperate in establishing adequate steamship communications, but they also issued urgent invitations to American capitalists to join with them in developing the resources of the Latin American countries. This community of interest is not limited to commerce and finance; it appears in the attitude of the Latin American republics as neutrals in the present world war. State after state has written or cabled its ambassador or minister in Washington to bring various matters of common neutral interest before the Pan American Council; as the director general of the Pan American Union recently said, the war has given a new significance and a new strength to Pan America. A short time after the war began both Argentina and Peru made proposals to the United States that all of the twenty-one American republics should unite in a definition of American neutral rights, and

should issue a declaration, as one of them specifically suggested, that no belligerent acts affecting neutrals should be permitted anywhere on the American side of the Atlantic. This fact is important in judging the sentiment of the Latin American republics, for it should be noted that this proposal of joint action was made not by the United States but by the Latin American countries themselves. Although our government did not see its way clear to adopt the proposals immediately, a committee of the Pan American Union has taken them under advisement; in the meantime the Latin American republics have been greatly influenced in their attitude towards the belligerent governments, and in their correspondence with them, by the diplomatic action taken by the United States.

Besides having many interests in common the Americas also are free from those causes of international conflict which have most frequently brought war to the old world. The rivalry for colonies, which has embroiled Europe from before the days of Columbus until the present, does not exist among us. The United States is the only American government which possesses colonies; Latin America does not covet them, and we ourselves are showing a nervous anxiety to be rid of our only colony of importance, the Philippines. The struggle for control of foreign markets in which to sell surplus manufactured goods, does not endanger our peace, as it has long endangered the peace of Europe; the present war, for example, was brought about, in no small measure, by the rivalry for economic control over Morocco, the Balkans, Turkey and Asia Minor. The United States is the only American republic which exports manufactured goods—the Latin Americans export raw products—and there is no competition among us on this score. America has no subject races, as has Europe; we have no Poland, no Macedonia, no Alsace-Lorraine. Finally we have no deepseated national and race antagonisms and hatreds, so common in the old world, and such a fundamental cause of war. If one travels in Europe there is no difficulty in distinguishing at once a typical German from a typical Frenchman, or a typical Englishman from a typical Turk; but only an expert can tell the difference be-

tween an Argentine and a Chilean, between a Peruvian and a Bolivian. In fact, there are no really fundamental differences between the Latin American peoples; nowhere on this hemisphere do we have deep-cut race distinctions, or hereditary national hatreds.

The American republics then have common interests, common forms and ideals of government, the common determination to settle international differences by arbitration and conciliation, and also, fortunately, are free from those factors which have most frequently plunged Europe in war.

It is only natural, under these circumstances, that a strong sentiment in favor of Pan Americanism has developed both in the United States and in the Latin American republics.

In our own country a policy of coöperation with Latin America has been favored in some form from the early days of the 19th century, when it was advocated by Henry Clay, several years before the announcement of the Monroe Doctrine. It was revived by James G. Blaine, who had the honor, as secretary of state, of presiding over the Pan American Congress held at Washington in 1889-90. Today it is endorsed, in some measure at least, by the national platforms of both the Republican and Democratic parties. The strength of this Pan American sentiment, especially among thoughtful people in this country, is shown with especial clearness by the wide-spread conviction that our time-honored Monroe Doctrine should be given up as an exclusive policy of the United States, and be placed upon a Pan American basis, that is, made a common principle of all of the American republics. Ex-President Roosevelt has advocated this idea with his usual impetuousness and vigor; ex-President Taft has endorsed it with his usual moderation; while President Wilson states that although the Monroe Doctrine should be retained as a policy of the United States, it should be supplemented by a Pan American policy which should serve the same purpose. From the answers to a questionnaire which the writer sent out three years ago, it seems evident that a majority of the professors of inter-

national law and diplomacy in this country and a considerable proportion of our leading magazines and newspapers believe that the Monroe Doctrine should in some way be made Pan American.

If this change should be made Latin America would undoubtedly approve the Monroe Doctrine. What Latin America resents is the historically recent feature of guardianship, protection and overlordship. The original Monroe Doctrine, that is, the policy of preventing aggressions of European nations on this hemisphere, has their almost unanimous support. At the end of the magnificent Central Avenue of Rio de Janeiro, in Brazil, is the beautiful building erected for the sessions of the Pan American Congress of 1906; it was named the Monroe Palace, in particular honor of the President of the United States who enunciated this doctrine, and it retains the name to-day. This fact would be impossible if the leaders of Brazil entertained a thorough-going dislike of the Monroe Doctrine. A still clearer evidence of the attitude of Latin America is seen in the action of the delegates of the Latin American countries at the Pan American Congress in Buenos Aires in 1910. It was there proposed that the Latin American countries, since it was the centennial year of their independence, should join in sending a message of greeting to their elder sister in the north, and in this message should express their appreciation of the service which the Monroe Doctrine had rendered them during the hundred years of their independence. This proposal was accepted in principle by the delegates of all of the Latin American republics present; but when they attempted to word the message of greeting and appreciation in such a way that it would show their approval of the original Monroe Doctrine and yet not commit them to the later policy of guardianship and tutelage it was found too difficult a task and no message was sent. The fact remains however that the Latin American countries agreed not only to express their approval of the original, simple Monroe Doctrine, but to openly thank the United States for the service which that doctrine had been to them for a century.

This same favorable attitude towards the Monroe Doctrine in its original meaning, especially if made a joint policy with the other American republics, is seen in recent utterances of leading statesmen of South America. Not long ago the President of Chile declared his belief in a Monroe Doctrine made Pan American; and evidence from Chile is particularly valuable since in no Latin American country has there been greater resentment against the tutelage aspect of the doctrine than in this most nationalistic of South American Republics. The Chilean Ambassador at Washington, Dr. Eduardo Suarez, has explained this attitude more definitely; in his carefully prepared address before the Second Pan American Scientific Congress in December, 1915, he said:

The Monroe Doctrine might have seemed a threat so long as it was only a right and an obligation on the part of the United States. Generalized as a derivation from the Pan American policy, supported by all the republics in the continent as a common force and a common defence, it has become a solid tie of union, a guaranty, a bulwark for our democracies.

The President of Argentina also has rather recently paid a public tribute to the policy of Pan American coöperation.

In Latin America countries this increased interest in Pan American coöperation has been notable during the past three years. Their latent suspicion of the United States, which was greatly intensified by the seizure of Vera Cruz, was turned by the Niagara Conference, called in the spring of 1914 to mediate in the Mexican situation, into almost an enthusiasm for Pan America. The foremost daily of all South America, *La Prensa* of Buenos Aires, exclaimed, "Blessed be Pan Americanism!" Some of the other leading journals of the A. B. C. countries have echoed this sentiment, declaring that Pan Americanism has now come to be an accomplished fact. These newspaper accounts have been substantiated by personal letters; from Chile an American acquaintance wrote, "Chilean opinion regarding the United States has made a complete revolution since the acceptance of the A. B. C. mediation, and now we are held in very high esteem." A distinguished statesman of South

America said to the writer, "The Niagara Conference has largely created a real Pan Americanism; it has made it actual; before this it was merely an ideal." The more recent coöperation between the United States and the six representative republics of South and Central America in an attempt to solve the Mexican situation has brought deep satisfaction to the peoples of Latin America. It may be that the action which they recommended, the recognition of Carranza, was not the wisest possible; but whether it was wise or unwise, this does not affect the fact that this coöperation produced a most fortunate impression throughout the Latin American world.

This Pan American sentiment probably reached its height at the Second Pan American Scientific Congress held at Washington a year ago this past December. The attitude of the United States was well expressed by the Secretary of State, who said in his address to the delegates:

Pan Americanism is an expression of the idea of internationalism. America has become the guardian of that idea, which will in the end rule the world. Pan Americanism is the most advanced as well as the most practical form of that idea. It has been made possible because of our geographical isolation, of our similar political institutions, and of our common conception of human rights.

Finally at the last day of the Congress the President of the United States, who had been keeping in close touch with the Pan American feeling shown among the delegates, definitely proposed a great League of American Republics to maintain peace on this hemisphere. He suggested that commissions should first be appointed to settle the boundary disputes which are so perplexing in many parts of South America and that the United States should then join with the other twenty American republics in a league which should guarantee to each country its independence and its territorial integrity. This proposal was well received at the Congress and since then has had the official endorsement of the presidents of two of the Central American states and probably—judging by personal statements from representative Latin Americans—has today the sup-

port of the best public opinion in every Latin American republic with the possible exception of Chile. The proposal is the most definite plan for the expression of Pan American solidarity which has yet been made. It is now being informally discussed among the leaders of the Central and South American countries and will undoubtedly be carefully considered at the next meeting of the Pan American Congress.

The attitude of the United States towards this kind of a league may be judged from the fact that the President of the United States, who is also the leader of one great political party, has proposed it; and that our last president, a leader of the opposing political party, has endorsed it. Mr. Taft says, "A league of nations in the western hemisphere would be a definite and, I think, a long step toward a league of nations in both hemispheres."

If we believe in the policy of Pan Americanism, whether carried out by a league or by a less definite system of co-operation, what should be done to develop and perfect this international principle, and what, it may be queried, are its limitations?

1. Keep the "big stick" policy on the shelf. We can not hold a club over our neighbors and, at the same time, coöperate with them as friends and equals.

2. Place the Monroe Doctrine upon a Pan American basis; make it the joint policy of the Americas, or, at least, cease regarding it as a policy of guardianship, tutelage and protection.

3. Do everything possible to make the peoples of these twenty-one American republics better acquainted with each other—with the best thought, ideals, and aspirations of each. Merely selling more goods to Latin America will not accomplish this. As an example of what we should try to do, there is the recent suggestion of a member of the Argentina government that the United States should appoint to the leading Latin American countries, instead of military and naval attachés, educational attachés to study and interpret the educational life and the culture of the other republics, and

to learn how the United States may best be of service to its southern neighbors.

4. Let the American republics develop and perfect an American League to Enforce Peace. But it should be understood that, while it is possible to have a league whose powers would be limited to giving to each of its members a joint guarantee of independence and territorial integrity, yet it is not possible to have a league with indefinite authority in which each state would have a single vote and in which a majority of the states could determine and control the common action of the Americas as a whole. The United States in population, wealth, trade and commerce is of more importance than all the other American republics combined. It would be absurd to attempt to form a league in which the five small Central American states might out-vote such countries as the United States, Argentina, Brazil and Chile. The American republics can agree to give each other certain definite guarantees, but they can not enter into a league to determine matters of general interest on the basis of equality of voting power.

5. Let us extend our trade with Latin America; but remember that the United States must stand for the "open door" on this hemisphere, just as it stands for the "open door" in the Orient. Let there be a fair field and no favors. If our business men, by energy, ability and organization, can extend our trade and commerce with Central and South America, so much the better; but if we attempt to shut the door against equal opportunity for the countries of Europe, by inducing the Latin American republics to discriminate against them by the erection of tariff barriers, or the withholding of concessions, we shall then be giving Europe a cordial invitation to unite in the overthrow of the Monroe Doctrine. In a volume on British foreign policy written before the war by Sir Harry Johnson, he said, in describing the things for which Great Britain should go to war, that it would probably even fight against the United States for one cause—an interference by the United States with the freedom of commerce and trade in Latin America. There seems unfortunately to be an idea among some in this country that

Pan Americanism means artificial advantages for the United States and a denial of the completely open door for Europe.

6. Let us coöperate whenever common problems arise. But the United States should realize that while the Latin American countries are willing and even eager to coöperate in the solution of most American problems, there is yet one field which they will not enter; they will not take part in any armed intervention in the internal affairs of any independent American republic. This attitude was made clear, if proof were needed, by the utterances of statesmen, by congressional debates and newspaper discussion throughout South America, a little over a year ago, just before the delegates of the United States and the six Latin American republics met in consultation over the Mexican situation.

It would be to the distinct present advantage of the United States to adopt a course of more complete coöperation with the other American republics. Such a policy would have given us, in all probability, a better solution of the Mexican problem. If at the time the Mexican revolution began to affect the interests of other lands, the President of the United States had laid the whole situation before representatives of the Latin American countries, and had stated that our government would deal with it as a common American problem and, after thorough consultation with them, had formulated a joint, all-American policy of action, this course would probably have preserved all that has been good in President Wilson's own Mexican policy and would have obviated all of its mistakes.

In the present war it would have been better had the United States joined with the other American republics to define and defend their common rights as neutrals. The Latin American countries, particularly Argentina, Chile and Brazil, have had the same problems that we have had; their rights have been infringed by both belligerents in the same way, especially by the submarine activity on the one side, and by the seizure of mails and the unjust application of the black list on the other. Efficient coöperation would

have been feasible, for the Latin American republics as individual states have taken practically the same attitude on questions of neutrality as has our own country.

Whenever the United States coöperates with Latin America it helps and furthers the policy of Pan Americanism. Whenever we coöperate in matters involving Europe, it gives our action greater strength. Whenever we coöperate in settling Pan American problems, it makes these problems easier of solution.

Taking a statesman's view and looking into the future, to the next few decades and even centuries, to a time when an increasing number of the Latin American republics will be strong, powerful, self-conscious states, it is clear that this new formula of coöperation is the only international salvation for the countries of this hemisphere; the only means of saving us from treading again the path of blood and war which Europe has trodden for two thousand years. The responsibility for developing our occasional Pan American coöperation into a definite system rests largely upon the United States, the strongest of the American republics. It is clearly then the part of American statesmanship to hold up as a national ideal a genuine coöperative Pan Americanism, to work for it, to make concessions for it, and, if necessary, to sacrifice minor issues to obtain it.